

HERMOSA CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON PRE-DECISIONAL EA

August 2017

Addressed in this document are the comments received during a 30-day comment period held during June and July 2017 for the *Hermosa Creek Watershed Management Plan* Environmental Assessment (EA). Previous input received throughout the public NEPA process for this project is summarized in a Scoping Summary and detailed in the project record. The Scoping Summary includes input received during a scoping period lasting from March 2015 through October 2016, which included five public field trips and release of an Initial Draft Proposed Action.

Approximately 80 total comments were received by the Forest Service (FS) during the 30-day public comment period from about 65 from interested individuals, 3 from environmental organizations, 4 from recreation advocacy organizations, and 4 from other government or tribal agencies (some entities submitted more than comment).

A summary listing of all the comments follows in the table, below. Complete comments can be found on-line at <https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=43010> for at least one year after the decision is made, and in the project record, available upon request at any time.

Per CEQ regulations, the FS has considered the comments received, and is responding in this document by indicating whether it will:

- (1) Modify alternatives including the proposed action,
- (2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency,
- (3) Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses,
- (4) Make factual corrections,
- and/or
- (5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response.

There were several comments that were heard from a number of different commenters, or that required a more expanded response or explanation than would fit in the table. These are common comments are addressed first:

COMMON COMMENTS WITH EXPANDED RESPONSES:

Common Comment #1. Already Considered Specific Suggestions.

Commenters made repeated requests for designations of specific trails or other suggestions that have already been considered during the course of the analysis, and dismissed from detailed analysis or inclusion in an alternative.

Expanded Response #1. Scoping comments have already been considered, and reasons for dismissal of suggestions are documented in the EA on pages 15-17, including variations on different seasonal closure dates. These will not all be reiterated here. However, one recurring comment deserves more explanation: the so-called “southern connector” trail.

Prominent in the comments was a request for a “southern connector” trail between the Colorado Trail (CT) and the Hermosa Creek Trail, including repeated submission throughout the planning process of a letter from Senator Bennet requesting that the FS “fully explore the possibilities of such a connection.” Commenters felt the FS had not given due consideration to the proposals. However, the FS has considered and explored this possibility and did not just dismiss it out of hand; there have been staff field visits, costs estimates, and GIS investigation. These initial investigations indicated that the proposal is unrealistic at this time, as stated in the EA, so it would have been irresponsible to invest more taxpayer time and money into further analysis.

One variation of this request was an alignment along Buck/North Buck Canyons, south of the wilderness boundary but still within the Special Management Area (SMA), connecting the Monument Hill area of the Junction Creek Road to the Lower Hermosa Trailhead. This option was investigated by both the FS and Trails 2000 and the consensus was that a historic alignment no longer exists. The FS was under the impression that the option had been jointly dismissed (see Trails 2000 scoping letter dated Sept. 30, 2016).

Another suggested variation of the alignment is from the Animas Overlook on the Junction Creek Road to the lower trailhead “at the 9000’ elevation.” This alignment would be about 15 miles in length with over half of that being entirely new construction in steep terrain, with the balance being the already-requested (and dismissed) user-made Seth’s trail. The roughly estimated cost would be at least \$1.5 million. Even though volunteer labor has been offered, the cost in planning, public involvement, analysis of impacts, clearances, trail layout and design, volunteer supervision, and long-term responsibility for maintenance is beyond the reach of the FS at this time. Most external grants will not pay for NEPA planning or FS staff salaries. But more importantly, the reason this alignment was not included in the EA is that over half of its length is outside of the watershed boundary and would be more appropriately addressed as a separate proposal. If funding becomes available which would cover all expenses, the FS could possibly give more consideration to such a proposal.

Some commenters mentioned an agreement or promise that they believed was made during the legislative negotiation process to replace the loss of Clear Creek to motorized and mechanized use. Such an alleged agreement is immaterial at this point if such an agreement was not included in the legislation. The FS was not party to any such agreement and manages based on the actual content of the law.

Common Comment #2. Recommended Wilderness.

Some commenters want the FS retain all recommended wilderness. Others want all recommended wilderness “released.”

Expanded Response #2. The rationale for the Proposed Action to release all remaining portions of recommended wilderness in the Hermosa watershed revolve largely around the results of the legislative process. The Forest Plan includes a larger land acreage as recommended wilderness than what was ultimately designated by Congress as actual wilderness. The remaining portions are some slivers in the Junction Creek Road vicinity, a polygon north of the new wilderness in the Corral Draw area, and a ¼ mile-wide strip along the creek. However, since Congress did not accept the full recommended acreage and designated only a portion of it, the FS acknowledges the final designation and proposes to release the remaining acres.

The small slivers of remaining recommended wilderness at the top of the Junction Creek Road are simply mapping refinements and the FS has no concerns with withdrawing these small acres from recommendation.

It was clear throughout the legislative negotiation process that the area surrounding the Corral Draw Trail was not designated as wilderness because it is currently a motorized and mechanized trail, and the collaborative negotiation intended that it remain with that designation. The FS acknowledges this, and is withdrawing that area from recommended wilderness.

The ¼ mile-wide strip along Hermosa Creek is the area of recommended wilderness that received the most comments. Whether the strip along the creek is recommended wilderness or not would not affect the ability to maintain the trail as was suggested by one commenter, because the trail is mostly on the east side of the creek and not within the recommended wilderness. Even where the trail briefly crosses to the west side (between Salt and Big Bend Creeks), it is not within recommended wilderness.

Likewise, whether this strip is recommended wilderness or not would not affect future designation as a Wild and Scenic River. Because Hermosa Creek is determined to be suitable for Wild and Scenic designation in the Forest Plan, there is already guidance in place to manage it to protect its free-flowing character, water quality, Outstanding Remarkable Values, and recommended classification. This strip is also protected by Colorado Roadless Area regulations, and by the purposes of the Hermosa legislation itself. FS feels that retaining the strip as recommended wilderness would not offer much more protection than already exists.

The possibility of conducting future stream habitat improvement projects would improve if the western streambank were not recommended wilderness, because the construction of man-made structures like fish barriers could be difficult to justify in recommended wilderness.

Common Comment #3. Additional Trails Needed.

Many commenters felt that more trails and closed roads should be designated for use, especially those that have been used for years, even if they aren't currently system trails. Some commenters felt that the proposed guideline for "no net gain" in trail miles shouldn't be included and goes beyond the intent of the legislation.

Expanded Response #3. Use of non-system roads or trails or use of closed ML 1 roads is considered cross-country travel. Under the requirements of the legislation, cross-country travel by motorized and mechanized vehicles is prohibited in the SMA now. The fact that the FS did not propose to designate many currently non-system trails is due to several reasons. First of all, user-made trails may be unknown to the FS and therefore were not considered. Secondly, other routes were not analyzed because they were never suggested to be designated during scoping (e.g. unspecified ML1 roads, Long Hollow Trail, Butler Trail). Others were suggested during scoping, considered by the FS, but not included in any alternative for various reasons given in the EA (e.g. Seth's Trail, Relay-to-Graysill connect). The *Initial Draft Proposed Action* document that was released in June 2016 for public scoping clearly listed and displayed on maps which trails were proposed to be included as system trails. It would have been appropriate at that time for the public to request specific trails that were not proposed by the FS. This was exactly the purpose for the FS taking the extra step of releasing a Draft Proposed Action, which is not required and usually does not occur.

Another reason the FS did not propose more currently non-system trails to be designated as system trails is that the Hermosa watershed already contains about 131 miles of system trails relatively well-distributed across the watershed. This should be a sufficient amount of mileage, considering the need to balance desires of various user groups. Furthermore, there are certain portions of the watershed that are at the threshold, or already exceed, the Forest Plan guideline for motorized route densities in elk production areas, so addition of motorized routes would require strong justification to vary from the Forest Plan guideline; this includes the Alt. 3 options of the Pasture Creek motorized trail and the designation of the Upper Dutch Trail for motorized use.

The Proposed Action contains a "no net gain" in trail mileage guideline which many commenters took exception to. Guidelines are defined in the Forest Plan, repeated in the EA on p.12, as allowing some flexibility in approach as conditions change and new information is obtained. Deviations are allowed, but would require documentation of rationale for the deviation at the time in the future that a decision is made to authorize a new trail. By including this guideline, future managers could choose to add new miles of trails, but only after careful consideration and documentation of how that action would meet the purposes of the legislation and the intent of the guideline. This does allow the future opportunity for additional trails as requested, but only after thoughtful deliberation.

One commenter stated that future new trails should be allowed because the Colorado Roadless Rule does not prohibit the addition of trails (motorized or non-motorized). This argument is peripheral to the discussion about Hermosa because management of the watershed is also dictated by the legislation. The site-specific joint effort of the grassroots working group and Congress established that the legislation was needed, and verifies that more than the typical or minimal amount of management protection is appropriate.

Common Comment #4. Seasonal Closure Dates.

Some commenters felt that applying seasonal closures to bicycles goes beyond the intent of the legislation. Others were concerned that seasonal closures interfere with hunting seasons.

Expanded Response #4. Motorized and mechanized uses are mentioned together throughout the legislation, therefore it is clear that they are meant to be treated equally. The EA provides further rationale why inclusion of bicycles in the seasonal closures is appropriate (p. 71, 87).

While it is true that the legislation did not require seasonal closures specifically, it does require the FS to administer the SMA to conserve and protect the resources therein, and only allows uses that further the purposes of the legislation. The need for more stringent management of the watershed than the rest of the forest (such as applying seasonal closures to mechanized use) is made apparent by the existence of the legislation itself.

Hunting season structures and dates are under the jurisdiction of Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) and not the FS. Season dates tend to change over time with little or no discussion with, or input from, the FS. CPW sets season dates on a state-wide basis and does not consider site-specific situations such as the local ski area operational dates. There are many, many acres of public land in Colorado that do not have motorized access for hunting; this is not a unique situation. While closure of the gates between, or in the middle of a hunting season is a logistical challenge, it can be addressed through educational contacts, signage, and coordinating with local CPW officers.

A discussion of why the specific dates are proposed is found in the EA pp 15-17.

Common Comment #5. Over-snow Travel.

Some commenters felt that expanded over-snow motorized suitable areas (Forest Plan level) and designated open areas (project level) are excessive in size, compared to the current Forest Plan. One commenter asked how over-snow areas were designed with the objective of minimizing impacts to natural resources, harassment or wildlife, or conflicts among users. Conversely, other commenters felt that fat tire bikes should be allowed on all trails in the winter and not restricted to just the open areas.

The Forest Plan map of over-snow suitability areas was not a decision about motor vehicle designations. Rather, Forest Plans are aspirational and provide guidance for project-level decisions about designations. In this case, evaluation of the Forest Plan map revealed inconsistencies between current uses and topography and areas depicted as suitable on the Forest Plan map. This was due, in part, to the broad scale at which the Forest Plan map was created. With the Hermosa analysis, there was an opportunity to align the Forest Plan suitability map to more closely reflect actual over-snow suitability specific to the Hermosa Area. The result is the Proposed Action suitability map that more closely aligns with actual resource concerns, potential conflicts between users, and use patterns in the Hermosa area.

The site-specific project-level evaluation also resulted in proposals for over-snow open area designations, which mimic the suitability areas. The project-level Proposed Action closely aligns with what has been depicted for many years on the Visitor Map as over-snow open areas. Because over-snow travel management planning has not been conducted on SJNF

before, there is no Over-Snow Vehicle Use Map designating open areas, so the Visitor Map has been used as an interim depiction of open areas.

Concerns regarding over-snow vehicle use in the Colorado River cutthroat trout re-introduction area appear to be unfounded in the project area. Snow compaction in the riparian zones of Hermosa Park is not known to negatively impact either streambank conditions or snowmelt patterns. This is because, while some public snowmobile use does occur in the meadows and over the top of the streams, this use is mostly dispersed and of a more occasional nature, and does not appear to be unduly compacting the snow in those areas; most snowmobile traffic stays on the groomed roads. An outfitter permitted play area is located in the meadow near the bottom of the ski lifts, however, no grooming occurs in the meadow or riparian areas. Monitoring of stream conditions is already occurring under Forest Plan and grazing requirements, and under this Hermosa Plan (EA p.65), and would reveal stream condition issues should they develop. An additional requirement aimed at monitoring snow compaction in the permitted play area in Hermosa Park will be added into the Final EA. If unacceptable impacts are identified, the permitted use can be moved.

When designating motorized trails and areas, the Travel Rule requires the FS to “consider effects with the objective of minimizing impacts”; these are commonly referred to as minimization criteria. These criteria were discussed, considered, and applied throughout the EA process, and will be further applied when a decision is made. The list of minimization criteria in the EA p.69 points the reader to where each criteria is contextually discussed throughout the EA, even if the particular terminology of “minimization criteria” or “minimization of impacts” may not have been used. Minimization criteria do not require the complete elimination of impacts or conflicts. Since the decision has not yet been made, the full rationale for how minimization criteria will be applied while balancing choices from alternatives is not yet available, but will be included in the Decision Notice. The minimization criteria only apply to designation of trails and areas at the project-level; they do not directly apply to Plan-level decisions about suitability or other plan components although similar considerations are used.

These considerations are described in the EA p. 32 and 92, which include minimizing impacts to wintering big game, minimizing user-group conflicts, having adequate snow cover, and use patterns.

Mechanized vehicles are considered together with motorized vehicles throughout the legislation, therefore, proposed management of these two vehicle classes in the winter is the same in the Proposed Action. Furthermore, at the project level, restricting mechanized vehicles (bikes) from the trails in the southern part of the SMA during the winter will provide better winter security for wintering big game. Allowing grooming of the Hermosa Creek Trail for fat tire bikes would run counter to this objective by disrupting wintering big game, and would require use of motorized vehicles in an area unsuitable for motorized use. Additionally, if the trail were groomed, the compacted snow would not melt as quickly in the spring and could affect the trail surface conditions negatively in certain locations beyond the proposed May 1 opening date.

TABLE SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DEIS COMMENT PERIOD

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
1	7Curiogeo		20170623	Thanks for closing illegal [Long Hollow] Trail	Thank you for your comment.
2	Adams		20170710	Beneficial to make CT non-motorized at Tin Can Basin	Supportive of PA
				Other portions of the CT are also coincident with Road 564, Divide Road.	There are indeed short segments where the CT crosses Forest Road 564. However, this road corridor is outside the watershed boundary, is managed by the Dolores Ranger District, and is not being analyzed in this EA.
				Segments 27 and part of 28 are also in or skirt the watershed	Correction was made to EA p.101
				Online map shows CT in the wilderness. Is this a mapping error?	It could be that the online map layers were drawing slightly off, or that you weren't zoomed in close enough to see the 50' buffer. The FS ensures that the wilderness does not overlap with the CT, and final maps required by the legislation will confirm this.
3	Altman		20170705	Include Big Lick, West Cross and Cutthroat Trails	Supportive of PA
4	Annast		20170710	Supports a southern connection trail	See Expanded Response #1
				Include Big Lick, West Cross, Cutthroat, and Purgatory Trails	Supportive of the Proposed Action
5	Anonymous		20170628	Keep [Sig] waterfall open	Supportive of the Proposed Action
6	Anonymous Jeff		20170609	Foot travel areas "stick it to the handicapped".	Thank you for your comment.
7	Arviso-Ciocco	Navajo Nation	20170612	No net gain in trails, expand over-snow suitability, vegetation management for resiliency, restrict motorized and mechanized to routes, dates, and OS areas, seasonal closure and prohibit dispersed camping at lower Hermosa, no mixed uses, eliminate 300' rule	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Retain all recommended wilderness	See Expanded Response #2
8	Bain		20170710	Supports Alt. 3 as most bicycle friendly	Thank you for your opinion.
				Allow bikes on Big Lick and West Cross Trails	Supportive of the Proposed Action

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Allow e-bikes on entire length of Cutthroat Trail	FS has reconsidered this option, and agrees that it is reasonable and intends to include it in the final decision. Impacts analyses (Alt. 3) did not reveal any additional unacceptable impacts by allowing e-bikes on this trail along with regular bikes. This will require the trail to receive a special designation on the MVUM.
9	Bain		20170710	trails that have been used for years are not proposed for designation	See Expanded Response #3
				Clear Creek, Big Lick, and West Cross should be open to bikes	Clear Creek is in wilderness and cannot be open to bikes. The other two trails are in the Proposed Action.
				Dirt bike use should not be impacted	Supportive of the Proposed Action, which does not change any single track motorized trails
				e-bikes should be allowed on all mechanized trails	FS policy considers them motorized vehicles- beyond the authority of the SJNF
				No seasonal closure during hunting seasons	See Expanded Response #4
				Should be exceptions to no net gain of trails	See Expanded Response #3
				Long Hollow Trail should have been designated	See Expanded Response #3
				Grazing results in noxious weeds - violation of state law.	Use of FS lands for cattle grazing is directly supported by the Forest Plan, and multiple use is a guiding principle of FS management. Cattle grazing impacts in this landscape were previously disclosed and analyzed in the Hermosa Landscape Grazing EIS (2009). Conditions of the grazing permit are administered separate from this planning effort; if those are not being met, please address your concerns to the District Ranger.
				Weed abatement should be done. Oxeye daisy is taking over Hermosa Park.	FS has treated approximately 4500 acres of weeds in the project area since 2010, and treatments are ongoing.
10	Baker		20170708	I support Alt. 4 to protect ecological resources.	Thank you for your opinion.
				There is no non-motorized trail option from the lower trailhead. Jones Creek should be non-motorized.	See Expanded Response#1. Foot and horse users are welcome to travel cross country if they wish to avoid motorized use. Closure of the Jones Creek Trail to motorized use would eliminate a key component of a popular single track loop.
				I oppose all timber harvest for resiliency goals, as they would have too much adverse impacts. Suggest only adopting the use of Rx burning and managed fire to achieve resiliency.	The legislation allows timber harvest for ecological purposes, to be consistent with the legislation. Any future timber harvest will require environmental analysis to ensure that the proposal will increase ecosystem resiliency, is necessary to achieve forest health or other ecological goals, and to ensure that it is consistent with the legislation. Mechanical vegetation treatment might be needed prior to being able to use fire as a management tool.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Supports the Research Natural Area (RNA)	Thank you for your opinion.
				Please prohibit logging in old growth, or include old growth in the RNA.	The Hermosa Proposed Action does not include any language specific to old growth because the existing Forest Plan includes protections for old growth which apply here as well. Furthermore, vegetation management in the SMA must be done to further the purposes of the legislation, and not for commercial reasons.
11	Barber		20170702	Form letter same as comment #8	See Response #8.
12	Baxter		20170710	Southern connector should be included	See Expanded Response #1
				Please do not include any seasonal trail closures, which would diminish the key aspect of living in the area.	See Expanded Response #4
				seasonal closure for bikes makes the SMA a de-facto wilderness	Correction: if the SMA were managed as wilderness, there would no bikes allowed anywhere in it at any time of year.
				Over-snow suitability (p.32) should allow for fat bikes on the Hermosa Creek Trail and should allow for groomed routes.	Suitability at the Plan level only applies to motorized uses, and does not designate specific trails. It appears you meant to comment on project level over-snow open areas, which <i>would</i> apply to bikes; see Expanded Response #5. Groomed routes <i>are</i> allowed in the open areas and in fact, already exist under permit.
				Include ML1 roads for bikes that make connections...	See Expanded Response #3
				...Elbert Creek Road, Elbert Creek Trail, West Cross, Big Lick, Cutthroat, Purgatory Trails	Supportive of PA
				...Graysill-to-Relay Creek ...	See Expanded Response #1
				...and Butler Creek Trail	See Expanded Response #3
				Allow ebikes on Cutthroat from the trailhead to Purgatory	See Response #8
				Please allow expansion opportunities in the future	See Expanded Response #3
13	Bender		20170711	Consider a southern connect at the 9000' elevation	See Expanded Response #1
				Long Hollow should be included as a system trail	See Expanded Response #3
14	Bergstrom		20170710	Disappointed that the southern connect was not even studied	See Expanded Response #1
				I support Alt. 3 for several reasons	Thank you for your opinion

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Financial benefits of multiple use are not recognized and are clearly important.	While the FS agrees with and recognizes the importance of public lands to the local economy, the decision to be made is how to manage the watershed to meet the multiple purposes of the legislation, none of which are financially-based.
				Oppose “no additional trails” [1:1 ratio] proposal because a bigger network will reduce conflicts	See Expanded Response #3
				Oppose trail restrictions based on special user groups, this is discriminating against other users based on special interests, for example, equestrian only.	The legislation itself speaks about motorized and mechanized separately from other kinds of uses. Correction: there are no equestrian only trail proposed. In fact, there are no trails that are designated for only one type of use.
				Include big lick, west cross, cutthroat, and Purgatory trails	Supportive of the Proposed Action
15	Bradshaw		20170627	I support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion.
16	Buickerood	SJCA	20170707	Last paragraph p.125 should be clarified that commercial timber harvest is not implied	An editorial change in wording has been made in the Final EA to now read, “Ski area operations, including snow making and timber management for safety or ecological restoration, may have a cumulative impact...”
				Strongly suggest Pasture Creek Loop trail not be incorporated because re-opening revegetated ML1 roads would miss the central purpose of protecting water quality	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Lengthen seasonal closure dates. The only drawback would be to recreation, all other resources would benefit. Also, consider how proposed dates “edge match” with the proposal for adjoining Rico-West Dolores Travel Management.	See Expanded Response #1 and EA rationale, p.16. Matching dates with Dolores RD was discussed internally at length. Please note that the dates discussed in RWD apply to motorized trails only, as the Dolores RD does not propose defined closure dates on roads. The Hermosa EA acknowledges that disposition of Road 578B and the coincident motorized East Fork Trail coming from Dolores RD will depend upon the RWD decision. The only “mis-match” will be that Dolores RD will not have seasonal closure dates for roads, and Columbine RD will; this would only affect two roads (Hotel Draw and Bolam Pass).
17	CatsmanGardner		20170627	Need to be open for bikes: West Cross, Big Lick...	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				...Clear Creek and Salt Creek	These two trails are in the Congressionally designated wilderness, which automatically prohibits bicycles.
				Eliminating bikes on “feeder” trails will cause them to disintegrate.	See Expanded Response #3

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Destruction of Long Hollow is ridiculous	See Expanded Response #3
				Cows are making illegal trails all over	See Response #9
18	CatsmanKathryn		20170702	Form letter same as comment #8	See Response #8
19	Chism		20170619	I support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
20	Churchwell	Trout Unlimited	20170710	Fishing is not mentioned on p.100 as a recreational use, but it is one of the most prolific uses	An editorial change in wording has been made in the Final EA to include fishing. Thank you for pointing this out.
				Supports maintaining all recommended wilderness as protection until Wild and Scenic status can be resolved. We recognize that doing so would the mechanized use of Corral Draw Trial would likely change- this we do not support.	See Expanded Response #2
				Questions the wisdom of doubling the area suitable for OS travel, seems counter to the intent of "keeping it like it is," and could have effects on Colorado River cutthroat trout habitat	See Expanded Response #5
				Supports the campground on the north side of E. Fork (Alt. 4) with an ATV bridge. Please clarify where trailhead parking will be allowed.	Editorial changes in wording have been made to clarify the relationship between the CG, the trailhead, dispersed camping, and the E. Fork Creek crossing, and how these would be managed in the interim until a new CG is built.
				Supports that the Sig CG road remains ML3	Thank you for your opinion
				TU makes statements of support for most other aspects of the Proposed Action	Supportive of the Proposed Action
21	ClarkAaron	International Mountain Bike Assoc.	20170710	Support for the legislation was predicated in an agreement that the trail losses would be equalized by addressing missing connections during the planning process...disappointed that the connection from Hermosa Creek to the CT is not being reviewed.	See Expanded Response #1
				Largely supportive of Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
				Seasonal closures were not part of the legislation, and to effect only some users is not supported. Bikes should not be lumped with motor vehicles.	See Expanded Response #4

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
22	ClarkDavid		20170710	Anyone riding bikes should be required to have a search and rescue fee and habitat stamp or non-motorized stickers	These programs are all administered by the state of Colorado, not the FS.
				If you have to make new trails, make them for all, not just 2-wheelers, and no trails in the wilderness at all.	Thank you for your opinion.
23	Cliff		20170619	I support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
24	Crites		20170710	See comment #12	See Response #12
25	Deller		20170705	Support for West Cross, Big Lick, and Little Elk as non-motorized	Supportive of the Proposed Action
26	Derck	Purgatory Resort	20170710	Request to add a section entitled "Relationship of this Plan to Purgatory Resort"	The EA p.11 already contains a section addressing this request titled "Relationship of this Plan to Other Authorizations and Decisions", which includes ski area operations. A sentence was added reading, "These activities are governed by their respective supporting documents such as NEPA decisions, design criteria, mitigation measures, special use permits, and annual operating plans."
				Support Alt. 1 for allowing mixed uses on the Hermosa Park Road. Or request enforcement of driving behavior before prohibitions are enacted, and request permit system for Purgatory OHV rental clients and residents to travel the road. Request a Design Criteria be added to allow mixed uses until the staging area is built. Would like to see more specifics about the proposed staging area.	Sent Engineering Report as requested. FS does not see driving behaviors as the issue, but rather, the issues are the road configuration, road condition, and traffic types and volumes. Issuance of private permits for use of the road by OHVs would not occur due to liability issues, since safety concerns have been identified. A Design Criteria had been added reading, "Prohibition of mixed uses on the first segment of Road 578 will not implemented until the OHV bypass or the staging area is built." Purgatory would be closely involved in the final design of a bypass route and/or the staging area, which would be designed to not interfere with winter operations.
				Would like to see more specifics about the new gate east of the upper Hermosa trailhead.	The exact location has not been determined, but it would not interfere with ski area operations because it would not be within the permit boundary.
				Questions regarding timeline for construction of the partially-completed snowmobile unloading area.	This parking/unloading area is outside the watershed boundary, has already been approved, and is not part of the Hermosa Plan. Mention of it has been removed from the EA to avoid further confusion. Questions regarding specifics should be directed to the District Ranger.
				Would like to make sure Purgatory staff and operations are not affected by seasonal closure dates.	See EA p.11 and amended wording above, and p.68. Special Use Permits terms can, and do, allow activities that are not allowed by the general public.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Concerns with seasonal closure dates of trails that start on private base area or front side of the ski area and then cross into the Hermosa watershed. How will this be delineated?	Seasonal closures would apply to all trails west of Road 581, including the road itself. FS feels this is an understandable and easily marked boundary.
				Support use of e-bikes on the entire Cutthroat Trail	See Response #8
				Concerns about SIO changes and how they will impact ski area operations. Appears to overlap private land.	SIO objectives in the alternatives are based on the corresponding recommended wilderness in each alternative. The ski area permit boundary is not affected by variations of SIO between alternatives. SIO does not apply to private land.
				Concerned that changing the desired condition for the creek to "Robust" may be more stringent than that used under the DMR EIS. Do not see anything in the legislation to explain this.	The whole premise of the original Hermosa Watershed Working Group and the resulting legislation is the protection of the watershed. Therefore, the more stringent application of management criteria is wholly appropriate. Desired Conditions are aspirational goals for the future and do not commit any course of action. The term "robust" has been FS policy under handbook direction and is not new.
				Clarify or remove the statement on p.119 that seem to contradict the analysis done for the DMR EIS.	You are correct, these kinds of impacts from snowmaking were analyzed, disclosed during the DMR EIS. Mitigation from that analysis includes on-going water quantity and water quality monitoring. The sentence on p. 119 was edited to reflect this.
				Mentions support for several aspects of the Proposed Action.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
27	DiCostanzo		20170710	Include the Cutthroat for e-bikes from Purgatory to the trailhead	See Response #8
28	Elliott		20171619	I support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
29	Email		20170629	Alt. 3 is the only option that makes common sense	Thank you for your opinion
30	Fox	WildEarth Guardians	20170710	The FS may not rely on area suitability determinations in a forest plan amendment as a substitute for winter travel planning. Areas must be "discrete", "specifically delineated," and "smaller than a ranger district."	The EA contains environmental analyses of impacts at the both the plan level (for suitability) and the project level (designation of open areas). Chapter 5 Impacts Analyses sections specifically separate analyses between the two levels of planning; however, some resource section analyses of over-snow impacts were missing, and therefore discussion has been added to the EA to include over-snow analysis for each resource at both the Plan and project levels. There will be two separate decisions and at the appropriate planning level, as required. Also see Expanded Response #5

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				FS fails to demonstrate in its analysis how the suitability area determinations, on which the over-snow open area designations are based, were designed with the objective of minimizing damage to natural resources, harassment or wildlife, or conflicts among users.	See Expanded Response #5 for how the minimization criteria were applied to the project-level designation. The criteria do not apply to designation of suitability.
				The FS should require minimum snow depths supported by the best available science...18" cross country and 12" on groomed trails.	The Hermosa Plan relies on language found in the legislation that speaks about authorizing the use of over-snow vehicles "when there exists adequate snow cover."
				Summer motorized travel designations must comply with minimization criteria. FS must demonstrate how it located the motorized use designations with the objective of minimizing impacts.	See Expanded Response #5 for a discussion of minimization criteria, which applies equally to winter and summer travel management analysis. Specific to over-ground designation proposals, minimization criteria were applied during the elimination of some suggested alternatives. For example, the Relay-to-Graysill connection trail was not considered in any alternative in order to minimize impacts to resources such as seeps and springs. Another example is that motorized use on some trails was not considered in detail in order to minimize conflicts between user groups. EA p. 15-17. Data used to determine resource impacts of over-ground travel with the objective of minimizing impacts include: FS team and staff field notes, E. Fork Hermosa Watershed Restoration Action Plan, ML1 roads inventory, and the updated TAP spreadsheet which rated resource risks for each motorized road and trail.
				Adding trails moves the forest in the wrong direction.	Protection of recreational resources is one of the purposes recognized and mandated throughout the legislation. Adding a handful of trails to the system is therefore not moving in the wrong direction according to the legislation. In highly used recreational areas like the Hermosa, adding trails can actually reduce conflicts among different classes of users and help apply the minimization criteria related to conflicts among users. For example, potentially adding the Cutthroat Trail as motorized for e-bikes would minimize conflicts among classes of motorized users on the Hermosa Park Road. There are no concerns with the minimization criteria regrading motorized use conflicts with neighboring federal lands or populated areas in this landscape. EA p.100.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				We strongly support the FS proposal to eliminate the 300' rule along Hermosa Park Road	Thank you for your support
				We support the FS efforts to create a resilient future road system...on a watershed scale.	Thank you for your support
				FS must consider the SJNF Travel Analysis Report. We support the efforts to identify the minimum road system.	Thank you for your support. The Forest-Wide TAP was considered. See EA p.81.
				However, we are very concerned that the FS identified no need to physically decommission ML1 roads proposed to be removed, or at the very least, barriers at the entrance of removed roads.	FS has identified locations as priorities for closure and decommissioning or rehabilitation on EA p.96. The statement on p. 176 that said no needs were identified has been modified to say, "There were few needs identified for physical decommissioning of ML1s..." FS stands by its opinion, based on inventory data, that more negative impacts would be created by physical disturbance of further decommissioning on the majority of the ML1 roads than any benefit that would be gained.
				Given the controversial scope of impacts...this project may have a significant impact and the FS should prepare an EIS	40 CFR 1501.4 defines when an EIS is required. Since an EA was prepared and no significant impacts were identified, and there was no controversy about the significance of effects identified during scoping or comments periods; an EIS is not required. Commenter does not specify what "controversial scope of impacts" they are referring to. Social controversy about the Proposed Action (e.g. which trails should be designated) is not the same thing as scientific controversy about the analysis of impacts.
				Clearly articulate the statement of Purpose and Need to include the FS duty to identify the minimum road system	See EA p.7, where an overview of the purpose and need states "to comply with the Travel Management Rule"; since the Travel Rule includes the requirement for identification of the minimum road system, it is inferred that this is part of the need. On p. 67 in the EA, where the project-level purpose is talked about in more detail, it states that "the proposal will also identify the minimum road system..."
				The FS must consider a broad array of impacts related to forest roads in its NEPA analysis...	See EA Chapter 5, Environmental Analysis of Impacts. Each resource area analysis discusses impacts from proposed changes to the road system under Project-Level Impacts headings.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				...climate change and forest roads. FS should start with a vulnerability assessment...include climate change as part of the affected environment...integrate into alternatives...consider in cumulative impacts	Vulnerability Assessments have been conducted for the SJNF (<i>Nydicke et.al. 2012, Decker and Rondeau 2014, Handwerk et. al. 2014</i>). Applicable guidance regarding planning for climate change is also found in the existing Forest Plan, Appendix G, which is not repeated in the Hermosa Plan, but is applicable to Hermosa. Project-specific additional climate change planning is incorporated into proposed Plan-level components 3.28.4, 3.28.14, and 3.28.15. At the Project-level, climate change is discussed as part of the descriptions of the affected environment in appropriate resource area sections in Chapter 5 of the EA. Cumulative impacts sections do not include climate change impacts because those sections only consider management actions, not large-scale or natural processes.
				FS must consider a reasonable range of alternatives and should consider an action alternative that provides some variability in the number of acres designated as suitable for over-snow travel. As written, the FS fails to consider a reasonable alternative that would increase suitable acreage, but to a lesser extent than Alts. 2 and 3.	Correction: FS believes you misread the table on p. 66. Alt. 4 is not the same as Alt. 1 and provides the requested alternative. Alt. 4 slightly increases over-snow acreage to 15,900 but provides a different configuration of acres than the Alt. 1 existing condition of 15,600. This is less than Alts 2 and 3 at 35,300 acres. Also refer to figures on EA pages 35-37.
31	Gilmore		20170710	Include the Cutthroat Trail as a specifically designated e-bike route from Purgatory to the Hermosa Creek Trail.	See Response #8
32	Harries		20170711	See comment #12	See Response #12
				Address Desired Condition 3.28.62. Many recreationists are upset with impacts from livestock	See Response #9
33	Hawkins		20170619	Please select Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion.
				Up to date science should be used...impacts noted in the Plan on issues that best available science has determined are unrelated.	Thank you for your opinion. FS feels it has used the best available science, commenter did not provide any specific examples of where it was not used.
34	Hertrich		20170622	Alt. 3 gets my vote	Thank you for your opinion.
35	Howell		20170627	I support Alt.3.	Thank you for your opinion.
				Big Lick Trail should be open to bicycles	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Open West Cross the bicycles	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Open Cutthroat Trails to e-bicycles	See Response #8

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Install a bridge over Hermosa Creek	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Obliteration of Long Hollow was unnecessary	See Expanded Response #3
36	Howell		20170701	Form letter same as comment #8	See Response #8
37	Jakoby	La Plata County Board of Commissioners	20170710	The EA supports continued management and protection of this area for public access. The Proposed Action will help promote natural resource protection and allow users to continue enjoying this area.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
38	James		20170710	Big Lick should remain open to bikes. Ass West Cross. Add Purgatory Trails. Include Cutthroat Trail.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Trails 2000's southern connection proposal should be analyzed	See Expanded Response #1
				Long Hollow deserves to be a system trail	See Expanded Response #3
				Add Relay-Graysill ML1 roads	See Expanded Response #1
				Leave the door open for future trail opportunities	See Expanded Response#3
39	Jones	CSA, COHVCO, and TPA	20170706	Vigorous support from these organizations for Alt. 3 and vigorously oppose Alt. 4	Thank you for your opinion.
				Columbine District staff assistance was deeply appreciated in developing the legislation	Thank you for your comment.
				Pasture Creek Trail would significantly improve recreational experiences and provide unique learning experiences for managers regarding 64" width side-by-sides.	Thank you for your opinion. Correction: The proposal under Alt. 3 to open the Pasture Creek Trail would be for all motorized vehicles, including full-sized, not limited to 64" or less.
				Dutch-Pinkerton [motorized] single track would be highly valuable loop opportunity.	Thank you for your opinion.
				Alt. 3 also provides the most dispersed camping, which is becoming difficult to obtain...	Thank you for your opinion.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				...allows the Coral Draw trail to be added to motorized inventory...	Supportive of the Proposed Action. Correction: The Corral Draw Trail is already designated as motorized single-track and remains so under all the alternatives. Perhaps you are referring to changing the over-ground motorized suitability to include the Corral Draw area, which is included in all action alternatives, and not just Alt. 3.
				...provides for the connector trail to the ski area and a unique experience.	Thank you for your opinion.
				Wilderness/RNA designations along Hermosa Creek should be released, which will streamline trail maintenance and any creek habitat management.	See Expanded Response #2. The boundaries of the RNA were defined in the Forest Plan and are not part of the Hermosa Plan decision.
				No net gain standard for roads and trail directly conflict with the legislation. This standard is not addressed in the Draft EA and the public does not have the ability to comment on it.	See Expanded Response #3. Correction: The proposal is for a guideline, not a standard, and would apply to trails but not roads. FS is puzzled by the allegation that the proposed <i>guideline</i> is not in the Draft (pre-decisional) EA because you are commenting on it now. See EA p.31. Furthermore, an even more restrictive version of this guideline was also included in the <i>Initial Draft Proposed Action</i> during scoping, and many people commented on it at that time as well.
				Snowfall is the best trigger for determining when to start winter travel management.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Motorized recreation is a significant economic driver	See Response #14.
				General wildlife concerns are well balanced with recreational interests in Alt. 3. Wildlife concerns should be minimal and significant documented planning standards can be relied on in defense of Alt.3.	Thank you for your opinion. FS believes this statement also applies to Alt.2, the Proposed Action.
				The possible listing of a species under ESA should not result in overly-cautious management.	There are no proposals in the Hermosa Plan that are directed at an ESA Proposed or Candidate species.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Document reviews from anti-access user groups addressing wildlife concerns with motorized recreation must be critically reviewed. Up to date science and best available science must be relied on. The Switalski document cited in the EA is out of date and the commenter submits their own booklet regarding motorized winter impacts.	The Hermosa EA did not rely or cite any information from the Switalski document regarding emissions, water or air quality, or impacts to lynx or wolverine; the only place this document is cited in the EA is in regards to snow compaction affecting the subnivean environment. The FS has made an additional effort to make sure the most current and best available research has been reviewed. Citations have been added along with the updated over-snow analysis in the EA.
				Commenter asserts that this is where the “no net gain” proposal originated and is based on superseded 2000 lynx LCAS guidance. Closing any area to over-snow travel for the benefit of lynx would be inaccurate and conflicting with best available science.	The proposal for no net gain in trail miles specifically states that it applies to over-ground trails (EA p.31); this has no relationship to over-snow areas and is not related to lynx impacts. See Expanded Response #3. The analysis on the EA and the Biological Assessment relies on the 2013 version of the LCAS, although the BA inadvertently cited the 2000 version. This was an oversight.
				Commenter is concerned that wolverine analysis is not based on best available science.	The wolverine was considered but dismissed from evaluation for the Hermosa Plan, and did not drive any of the Proposed Action. (EA p.146 and BA p.31).
				Switalski document is cited as authoritative on issues such as concerns about subnivean activity. This document is not research, but rather a summary of research. Provided booklet from the ACSA provides review that there is no relationship between over-snow travel and subnivean activity or impacts.	The commenter complains that the Switalski document is only a summary of other research, but the ACSA booklet is the same type of summary. The FS has made an additional effort to make sure the most current and best available research has been reviewed. Citations have been added along with the updated over-snow analysis in the EA.
				Commenter questions how best available science could be relied on to create a management position that closures of an area to vehicle travel were necessary to protect ptarmigan.	Correction: The Proposed Action does not propose to close any areas for the protection of ptarmigan. In fact, all three action alternative result in a “may adversely impact individuals” determination for ptarmigan because of the expansion of over-snow open areas in those alternatives (EA p.164).
40	Krebs		20170708	I used to be able to gather firewood along lower Hermosa Road, now I can't.	There has been no change, or proposed changes, in firewood gathering regulations.
				Hermosa Creek drainage is overgrazed...is disgusting. Scale back the grazing.	See Response #9

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
xx	Kuwanwisiwma	Hopi Tribe	20170724	We generally support the proposed action. However we recommend the Forest undertake a cultural resources analysis of the 66,000 acre SMA that have not been surveyed.	Thank you for your support. While the FS would like to be able to survey the whole SMA, financially it is not possible. Cultural survey protocol is based on agreement with the SHPO and relies on surveying of those areas that could be impacted by management actions resulting in increased usage, as well as a sample of the plan area.
41	LarsenCurt		20170708	Were promised additional mileage when Clear Creek and S Fork were closed [to motorized use].	FS assumes you are speaking about motorized use in your comments since you are affiliated with SJ Trailriders. See Expanded Response #1. Correction: South Fork Trail was never open to motorized use.
				Seasonal date of 5/1 is too late.	See Expanded Response #1 and EA pp15-17. Thank you for your opinion.
				Open Little Elk and Upper Dutch to motorized	See Expanded Response #1. Thank you for your opinion.
				Comment period length is unrealistic.	36 CFR 218 regulations at the national level set the length of the comment period
				Alt. 3 should be supported for winter ROS	Thank you for your opinion
42	LarsenDiane		20170711	Arbitrary dates for opening seems wrong. Weather should dictate or trails be open all the time.	See Expanded Response #4 and EA p.16.
				Replacing dispersed camping at the upper trailhead with a campground is wrong. Large groups will be unfeasible at a campground.	The design for a new campground has not been done, but it is possible that it could contain a group site. Also, groups would be welcome to use dispersed campsites.
43	Lommele		20170710	e-bikes would be a great recreation opportunity for the Hermosa Area	Supportive of the Proposed Action
44	LiebetrauLloyd		20170708	I support Alt. 3 for several reasons.	Thank you for your opinion.
45	LiebetrauMarilyn		20170708	Same as comment #44	See Response #44
46	Lloyd		20170609	Connecting Relay Road to Greysill should be designated for single track	See Expanded Response #1
47	Lykke		20170706	We support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
48	Marusak		20170707	Form letter same as comment #8	See Response #8.
49	McWilliams		20170707	The final map [in the EA] is a variance from the legislative map that if implemented, would invalidate claims filed after the legislation.	The GIS layers of the SMA boundary on the legislative map and on the EA map are exactly the same in the area of your referenced claim. The FS demonstrated this to you at the public meeting; the only difference between the two maps in the vicinity of your claim is the background map.
				Proposed goals to buy out of eliminate mineral claims is adverse the bill that states it is subject to valid and existing rights.	The Proposed Action plan components clearly state that they recognize valid and existing rights, including valid mineral claims. Acquiring mineral rights would only be from willing sellers. EA p.49.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Appears that there is bias against certain interests. Other parties were invited on tours but others were never given those opportunities.	FS disagrees with this statement. Five public field trips were offered to anyone who wanted to come. Each trip was advertised in the Durango Herald through press releases, at the public scoping meeting, and an email announcement that was sent to the project contact list of interested individuals, including yourself.
				Had an accurate map and legal description been provided ...current conflicts could have been avoided. Commenter quotes map disclaimer that says it may not be used to determine title ownership, legal descriptions, or boundaries..."	FS has no control over the content of the legislation. The legislative map was prepared for Congress by the FS at their request, but no metes and bounds or narrative legal description was requested by Congress. As you pointed out, the maps provided were not to be used to determine legal descriptions or boundaries.
				Parcels A and B – inability for surface disturbance and timeframes for reclamation are not reasonable.	The proposed Desired Condition 3.28.83 says non-surface disturbing agreements EXCEPT for parcels A and B. This is aspirational and subject to agreement from mineral-holder. Standard 3.28.85 says no surface disturbance, but refers only to leasable minerals (oil and gas), not locatable minerals. Standards 3.28.86 says surface disturbance can occur with an authorized Resource Conservation Protection Plan.
50	Miner		20170710	Form letter same as comment #31	See Response #31
51	Mitchel		20170612	Support of adding the Corral Draw connector and Big Lick for mechanized, don't add Upper Dutch as motorized	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Re-examine the unsuitability of Little Elk Trail for motorized	See Expanded Response #1
52	Monroe	Trails 2000	20170710	550C (ML1) is a great access to West Cross...bring on as a FS trail	See Expanded Response #3
				Big Lick should remain open to bikes	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				The feasibility of the southern connector trail should be studied in the this EA.	See Expanded Response #1
53	Monroe	Trails 2000	20170708	The relationship between economy and public lands was not addressed, but cannot go unstated	See Response #14

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Because the wording of “mechanized travel is only allowed on designated routes” is relatively new information to the community, some trails were not listed [requested] as designated routes, including the Long Hollow Trail.	See Expanded Response#3 FS does not understand how this would be new information to the community; the wording has been in the legislation since it was passed in 2014, and is clearly stated and shown on maps in the Initial Draft Proposed Action released during scoping in June 2016.
				The connector trail should be included in Alt. 3, with wording “as funds allow, we will consider proposals...” As recently seen during CT closures for a fire, there is not an alternative southern route available.	See Expanded Responses #1 and #3 Those who recreate in nature must accept the unpredictability of fire (or weather in general) as part of the natural system. It would be impractical for the FS to try to anticipate when trails might be closed or impassible and plan for contingencies on every mile of trail.
				Closure dates from November to May are disconcerting. Trail users are looking for year round access.	See Expanded Response #4
				Over-snow suitability should include fat bikes on the Hermosa Creek Trail...could be easily groomed.	See Response #12 and Expanded Response #5
				Many recreationists are upset with the impacts from livestock. We'd like to see grazing permits on trails that are less popular.	See Response #9
				We agree to remove all previously recommend wilderness	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Please include keeping roads and trails open year-round to non-motorized bike travel.	See Expanded Response #4
				ML1 roads that create natural connects should be kept open, including Elbert Creek Trail, Elbert Road...	See Expanded Response#3 Elbert Creek Trail and Elbert Creek Road are part of the Proposed Action to be open for bikes.
				...Graysill to Relay Creek Road	See Expanded Response#1

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Seasonal closures speak only to motorized and mechanized use which is a discriminatory policy. The SMA does not disallow bikes and by adding this language, it is managing as pro facto wilderness. We highly recommend and request that if there are seasonal closures that it not include mechanized travel. Trails 200 does not agree with enacting more seasonal trail closures.	See Expanded Response #4 Correction: If the SMA were managed as wilderness, there would no bikes allowed anywhere in it at any time of year.
				We agree that West Cross be included in the system	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Agrees with opening of Cutthroat Trail. E-bikes should be allowed along the entire route.	See Response #8
				Adding a motorized loop in Pasture Creek appears to be a good decision, removing UTV use around Hermosa.	See Expanded Response #1 Correction: If the trail were added, it would not remove UTV use elsewhere, and could, in fact could encourage more UTVs to visit the area.
				Adding motor use to Dutch Pinkerton is a good addition for motorcycles	See Expanded Response#1
				Elbert Creek Trail, Bid Lick And West Cross should allow bikes as Alt. 3 suggest.	Supportive of the Proposed Action; these are also included as open to bikes in Alt. 2.
				We recommend allowing for over-snow trail, including fat bikes, as stated in Alt. 3	See Expanded Response #5 Correction: None of the alternatives propose to allow fat bikes to travel over snow on trails; over-snow travel would be designated by open areas.
				Mountain bike conflicts with hikers and horses is very rare, and it appears this is an overstatement and not necessary in this report. p.100	FS has indeed heard from multiple sources that conflicts do occur and it should be acknowledged.
				Proposed guideline for net trail miles appears subjective. Trails 200 prefers Alt. 3.	See Expanded Response #3
				Trails 2000 makes various offers to help with trail construction and maintenance.	Thank you for your offer. See Expanded Response #1.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
54	Morgan		20170619	I support Alt. 3. Multiple use has proven to provide the biggest economic benefit to the local economies...and is a longstanding USFS tradition	See Response #14
				It should be noted that OHV users provide support through substantial contribution to CO OHV grant funds.	Thank you for your comment.
55	Nelson		20170619	I support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
56	Noonan		20170707	We can love something so much that we damage its future forever. A valuable commodity that is quickly disappearing is peace and quiet.	Thank you for your opinion
				I ask that all sections of trail not now opened to motorized travel stay closed to motorized uses.	Supportive of the Proposed Action (except for e-bike proposal)
57	Paraso		20170710	Form letter same as comment #31	See Response #31
58	Pizzi		20170710	Form letter same as comment #31	See Response #31
59	Potts		20170611	Trail [ML1 road] 580 between Relay Road and Bolam Pass is a vital connector for creating loops. I believe it is used by commercial guiding services and should be left on the system.	See Expanded Response #1 There is no permitted commercial use on non-system trails such as this route.
60	Provencher		20170709	Disappointed you did not include proposal to study a southern connect	See Expanded Response #1
				Upset by the closure of Long Hollow Trail and should be listed as a system trail. We were not aware that we needed to comment on the trail to be included as a system trail	See Expanded Response#3.
				Please do not include another seasonal closure.	See Expanded Response #4
				More trails in Purgatory that connect to Hermosa seems a perfect fit	Supportive of the Proposed Action?
				E-bikes on Cutthroat to Hermosa Creek is a great plan	See Response #8
				Please continue to allow bikes on Big Lick Tail	Supportive of the Proposed Action

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Would like to see more ML1 road connections, to West Cross and Relay to Graysill	See Expanded Response #1, #3
				Would like to see West Cross as a system trail	Supportive of the Proposed Action
61	Rinderle		20170710	See comment #12	See Response #12
62	Ritchey		20170710	Supportive of adding West Cross, cutthroat, and Big Lick as non-motorized and open to bikes	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Support closing the Tin Can Basin Road and rerouting the CT	Supportive of the Proposed Action
63	Robinsons		20170704	Form letter same as comment #8	See Response #8.
64	Saadallah		20170702	No comments included	
65	Schiff		20170710	I agree that Upper Dutch should remain closed to motorized	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Strongly agree with 3.28.63 regarding adaptive management for grazing. I hope proactive management strategy can be adopted versus one that only attempts to fix already impaired streams.	Supportive of the Proposed Action. Also see Response #8.
66	Schwartz		20170710	Trails 2000 southern connect should be analyzed	See Expanded Response #1
				Big Lick should remain open to bikes...include Cutthroat Trail...Add West Cross...add Purgatory trails	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Long Hollow deserves to be a system trail, and ML1 West Cross loop	See Expanded Response #3
				Leave the door open for future trail opportunities	See Expanded Response #3
				Increase the lift access opportunities	Purgatory operations such as the amount of lift access provided are not part of this analysis for two reasons: the lifts are not within the watershed boundary, and ski area operations are managed under an existing special use permit.
67	Sippy		20170710	Please reconsider Trails 2000 plan for a southern connect proposed at 9000' elevation.	See Expanded Response #1
				Long Hollow should be included as a system trail	See Expanded Response #3

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				Continue to allow bikes on Big Lick, ass West Cross, Purgatory Trails, and the Cutthroat Trails. Over snow travel should be included for Snowmobiles and bikes.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Add Relay and Graysill... I like additional single track moto trial on the Pinkerton	See Expanded Response #1
				E-bike route on Cutthroat to Hermosa Trail	See Response #8
				I would not support seasonal closures to bikes	See Expanded Response #4
				Include an option to add more trails in the future	See Expanded Response #3
68	Slavens		20170619	I fully support Alt. 3 and vehemently oppose Alt. 4	Thank you for your opinion
69	Thompson		20170626	A plan regarding restricting grazing must be developed. Range animals are responsible for a disproportionate amount of destruction. The damage caused by cattle far exceeds any possible monetary offsets.	See Response #9
				Salt Creek or Clear Creek should be maintained as an exception to the wilderness for a connection between the CT and Hermosa	Wilderness designation (and exceptions to it) are made by Congress and are beyond the jurisdiction of the FS
70	Thorpe	Colorado Parks and Wildlife	20170711	The Proposed Action calls for expansion of the over-snow use area. Increased recreational usage of steep and treed terrain reduces effectiveness for lynx. We recommend including a more comprehensive analysis of potential impacts to lynx.	See Expanded Response #5. See the Biological Assessment for more details on the lynx analysis.
				CPW strongly supports the Proposed Action 1:1 ratio for trails, and encourages the FS to engage the local trail advocacy groups to educate them about this and "no cross country travel."	Supportive of the Proposed Action. FS encourages the CPW to join us in educational efforts.
				Support leaving the Pinkerton Trail non-motorized.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Recommends the Big Lick Trail be non-mechanized	See Expanded Response #1

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				CPW supports seasonal closures for both motorized and mechanized and restriction of mechanized over-snow travel to open areas.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Recommends careful monitoring of E Fork for watershed conditions	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				Concerned the cattle trails become utilized by recreationists.	See Response #9
				Weeds are a concern in the Hermosa Park area and a robust effort should be made to control them.	Supportive of the Proposed Action. See Response #9
				Supports permanent closure on dispersed camping along Lower Hermosa Road and addition of a gate with seasonal closure.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
71	Vanatta		20170708	I prefer Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
				A legal [motorized] route to Purgatory would be wonderful	While mentioned in Alt. 3 as a possibility, no alignment has been identified. Close cooperation with Purgatory will be necessary because the route would need to end on private land and avoid impacting other ski area operations. This option can be considered in the future when details of alignment are resolved.
				A pre-determined limit on total trail net gain makes no sense.	See Expanded Response #3
72	Vastola		20170623	Supportive of Alt. 3 for allowing motorized recreation in the Dutch Pinkerton area	Thank you for your opinion. See Expanded Response #1
73	Vierra	San Ildefonso Pueblo	20170711	No comments submitted. Interested party for continued tribal consultation.	FS will continue consultations with the pueblo.
74	Wasko		20170710	Form letter same as comment #31	See Response #31
75	Weinert		20170710	Form letter same as comment #31	See Response #31
76	Witwer		20170619	I have seen 100 times more OHVs than hikers. We need more OHV trails, not fewer. I strongly support Alt. 3	Thank you for your opinion
77	Word		20170619	I am a homeowner at Purgatory. I strongly support Alt. 3.	Thank you for your opinion

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
78	Young		20170710	Include a definition of “robust” stream health on p.65. Where does a person find the Watershed Conservation Practices Handbook?	In the interest of brevity, existing policies are not repeated in the EA. However, all documents used in the analysis and preparation of this and other EAs are always available upon request, as stated throughout the EA. All Forest Service Handbooks and Manuals can usually be found quickly by searching the internet.
				Roads should not be closed before big game hunting seasons are completed.	See Expanded Response #4
				I agree with no mixed uses on 578 proposal. The money for the staging area could be spent instead to improve conditions of the s-curves. Why would we build a new campground when the road causes undue wear and tear on vehicles?	While dust control, widening, and more frequent grading could improve road conditions, it would do nothing to improve the alignment and traffic volume, and would likely even increase vehicle speeds. From the current amount of use, it appears that the road condition are not prohibitive for the people that use road 578.
				I don't think we should take down a good bridge (and the expense of it) at South Fork Trail to eliminate illegal bike and OHV use. If there are that many rebel users then maybe they should not be allowed in the SMA at all.	If the South Fork Trail is removed from the system as proposed, the bridge should also be removed so that conflicting messages are not portrayed. The elimination of an “attractive nuisance” encouraging illegal use is a valid reason for removal of the bridge. The Legislation requires that both motorized and mechanized use be allowed in the SMA.
				I cannot find remarks in the Plan for dispersed camping criteria for trail users.	Language has been added in the Dispersed Camping section (EA p.93) to clarify that driving a motorized or mechanized vehicle off-trail for camping is restricted to one vehicle length. The language was also clarified in the Design Criteria on p.96.
				I am glad Seth's Trail is not a consideration because it probably runs right through the Dutch Creek Allotment Gathering Pasture.	Supportive of the Proposed Action
				I am weary of the increase in acreage for RNAs from the previous to the current Forest Plan. And now I see a huge RNA in the Hermosa.	Delineation of the Hermosa RNA was done when the Forest Plan was revised (2013) and is not part of this Hermosa Plan decision.
79	Zauberis		20170710	I support keeping Upper Dutch/Pinkerton non-motorized	Thank you for your opinion.
				The proposed seasonal dates are reasonable; it is necessary to allow grazing permittee to locate and gather cattle late in the fall.	If necessary grazing permittees can be authorized access that the public would not be allowed for administration of their permit.

Comment #	Name	Affiliation	Date Received (year,month,day) <i>Italics= rec'd after close</i>	Topic, Issue, or Quote	FS Response
				I object to the removal of the three trails in the wilderness from the system because of the access they provide to a large percentage of the wilderness. With designation of the wilderness use will increase. The proposed removal of the bridge should not be done; the money could be better spent elsewhere.	The impacts on recreationists are recognized on p.113-114 of the EA. The FS feels that there will be little change on the ground from removal of these trails from the system because they receive little to no FS maintenance anyway and the public will likely continue to use them.
				The Nov 15 closure date is not consistent with the hunting seasons.	See Expanded Response #4
				Agree with no mixed uses on segment of 578. The new campground will increase traffic. I suggest improving the condition of this segment with increased maintenance.	Supportive of the Proposed Action. Increased maintenance can occur at any time outside of this planning effort if funding were available.
				In general, I am in agreement with Alt. 2	Thank you for your support.
80	Zink		20170708	Please ban drones from flying over the SMA unless a permit has been obtained.	See EA p. 68. Airspace is regulated by the FAA, not by the FS.
				Please treat all Category I and II e-bikes as bicycles.	FS policy considers e-bikes as motorized vehicles. This is policy above the level of the SJNF.
				Please treat e-motorcycles as any other motorcycle.	FS policy would likely consider them as motorized vehicles, just like combustion engine motorcycles.
				When and if e-snowmobiles are developed please treat them as any other snowmobile.	FS policy would likely consider them as motorized vehicles, just like combustion engine snowmobiles.